

the responsibility of the USD (AT&L) for oversight of the chemical weapons demilitarization program, including ACWA, nor the USD (AT&L)'s responsibility as defense acquisition executive for the acquisition category 1D program.

Section 922—Comptroller General Review of Cost-Benefit Analysis of Off-Site Versus On-Site Treatment and Disposal of Hydrolysate Derived from Neutralization of VX Nerve Gas at Newport Chemical Depot, Indiana

This section would require the Comptroller General to review and report to Congress by December 1, 2006, on the adequacy of the cost benefit analysis prepared by the Secretary of the Army comparing options to treat and dispose of the hazardous material that is a byproduct of the process of neutralizing VX nerve gas stored at Newport Chemical Depot, Indiana. This section would also prohibit the Secretary from proceeding with any action to transport this hazardous material, or hydrolysate, until 60 days after the Comptroller General's report is received by Congress. Pending enactment of this section, the committee intends that the Secretary of the Army take no action to transport hydrolysate from Newport Army Depot until the actions that would be required by this section are completed.

Section 923—Sense of Congress Regarding the Safe and Expeditious Disposal of Chemical Weapons

This section would express the sense of Congress that the process used for selecting a site for remote disposal of hazardous material remaining after the initial processing of chemical munitions should be free from political influence and that a process similar to that used for base closure and realignment be considered for adoption.

SUBTITLE D—INTELLIGENCE-RELATED MATTERS

Section 931—Repeal of Termination of Authority of Secretary of Defense to Engage in Commercial Activities as Security for Intelligence Collection Activities Abroad

This section would amend section 431(a) of title 10, United States Code, to repeal the termination of authority for the Secretary of Defense to engage in commercial activities as security for intelligence collection activities abroad.

TITLE X—GENERAL PROVISIONS

ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST

COUNTER-DRUG ACTIVITIES

Overview

The budget request contained \$926.9 million for drug interdiction and counter-drug activities, in addition to \$131.9 million, for operational tempo which is included within the operating budgets of the military services. The fiscal year 2007 budget is organized to address four broad national priorities: (1) international support; (2)

domestic support; (3) intelligence and technology support; and (4) demand reduction.

The committee recommends an authorization for fiscal year 2007 Department of Defense counter-drug activities as follows:

FY07 Drug Interdiction and Counter-Drug Request	\$926,890
International Support	\$435,919
Domestic Support	\$205,416
Intelligence and Technology Support	\$151,322
Demand Reduction	\$134,233
Recommended Decreases	
SOUTHCOM	
NORTHCOM	\$7,000
PACOM	\$2,000
CENTCOM	\$1,000
Intelligence and Technology	\$2,000
Support	\$4,000
Recommended Increases	
Southwestern Border Fence	\$10,000
Maritime Domain Awareness	\$6,000
Recommendation	\$926,890

Items of Special Interest

Budget requests

The fiscal year 2007 drug interdiction and counter-drug activities budget request of \$926.9 million covers all counternarcotics resources in the Department of Defense (DOD) with the exception of those resources in the operating budget for the military services for operational tempo, military personnel, and military construction. The committee notes that the services' budget requests include an additional \$131.9 million for operational tempo expenses related to counter-drug activities in their respective appropriations. The committee, therefore, directs the Secretary of Defense to integrate the associated operational tempo costs contained in the services' budgets for drug interdiction and counter-drug activities into DOD's drug interdiction and counter-drug activities budget justification material for fiscal year 2008, and thereafter. The committee directs that the budget justification material which lists drug resources by function shall include the associated operational tempo costs to the services in the total budget request by the Department for counter-drug activities.

Counternarcotics policy for Afghanistan

The committee supports the efforts of the Department of Defense (DOD) to use drug interdiction and counternarcotics resources to support the global war on terrorism and notes that there are clear links between international narcotics trafficking and international terrorism. In that regard, the committee supports DOD's unified campaign against narcotics trafficking and activities by organizations designated as terrorist organizations in Colombia and Afghanistan. The committee notes with regards to Afghanistan, the Department has responded to requests for support from the Department of State, the Drug Enforcement Administration and the Government of the United Kingdom to help the Government of Afghanistan develop the capacity to address the country's serious and growing narcotics problem. The committee believes that the high level of DOD support to the Department of State in building law enforcement capacity in Afghanistan is the correct approach.

The committee is concerned that despite the development of an interagency implementation plan for U.S. counternarcotics activities in Afghanistan and the surrounding region, the Department is being asked to fund and manage activities that are well beyond its core mission. The Department must continue to play an important role in the international and interagency fight against narcotics in Afghanistan, but it must not take on roles in which other countries or other agencies of the U.S. Government have core capabilities.

Intelligence and technology

The budget request contained \$151.3 million for intelligence and technology support.

The committee understands the importance of intelligence and technology in the counternarcotics program. Intelligence and technology are used to dismantle narcotics networks and terrorist organizations linked to drug trafficking. The committee notes that the authorization of funds for intelligence and technology will result in increased development, testing, evaluation, and deployment of technologies that collect and monitor narcotics intelligence on land, sea, and in the air.

Accordingly, the committee recommends \$147.3 million for intelligence and technology, a decrease of \$4.0 million. The recommended funding represents a significant increase over the fiscal year 2006 authorization.

Maritime domain awareness

The budget request contained \$2.5 million for research and development of a detection and monitoring domain awareness system. This system integrates multiple sensors, databases, and anomaly detection tools into a data fusion testbed that provides persistent-situational awareness across domains and operation systems. One system under development provides wide-area surveillance, maritime domain awareness, and distributes actionable intelligence concerning potential narcotics trafficking or terrorist threats. This system operations succeeded in a test conducted by Joint Task Force-North and will be evaluated during fiscal year 2007 by the Joint Interagency Task Force-South and in Colombia.

Accordingly, the committee recommends an increase of \$6.0 million for this purpose.

Southwest Border Fence

The committee is concerned that the southwest border continues to be a heavily utilized human and drug smuggling corridor allowing access into U.S. metropolitan areas from Mexico. Since 1990, construction and rehabilitation along this prolific drug smuggling corridor has resulted in 7.6 miles of double-layer fencing, 59 miles of single fencing, and 169.5 miles of road. These advances have reduced drug trafficking into the region and have eliminated the smuggling corridor.

Completing the fence construction project in San Diego, California, will allow counter-drug assets to be redeployed to other areas. The committee supports this fence and road-building activity in the southwest region. Funds authorized within this Act shall be used to complete construction of the 14-Mile Border Infrastructure System near San Diego, California; increase the height of existing

border vehicle barriers to a minimum of 10 feet; and build an additional 5 miles of primary fencing east of the Otay Mesa port of entry. In addition, not less than \$3.0 million shall be used to design, plan, deploy and rehabilitate fencing for 15 miles on either side of the Laredo, Texas port of entry. Finally, not less than \$2.0 million shall be used to design, plan, deploy and rehabilitate fencing at the Marine Corps Air Station, Yuma, Arizona.

Accordingly, the committee recommends an increase of \$10.0 million for this purpose.

U.S. Central Command operations support

The budget request contained \$27.6 million for U.S. Central Command (USCENTCOM) and participating nation support for USCENTCOM operations. Reductions in support activities are planned, in light of other worldwide commitments.

Accordingly, the committee recommends a decrease of \$2.0 million for this purpose.

U.S. Northern Command operations support

The budget request contained \$15.5 million for U.S. Northern Command domestic operations support. Reductions in support activities are planned, in light of other worldwide commitments.

Accordingly, the committee recommends a decrease of \$2.0 million for this purpose.

U.S. Pacific Command operations support

The budget request contained \$27.2 million for U.S. Pacific Command (USPACOM) and participating nation support for USPACOM operations. Reductions in support activities are planned, in light of other worldwide commitments.

Accordingly, the committee recommends a decrease of \$1.0 million for this purpose.

U.S. Southern Command operations support

The budget request contained \$372.7 million for U.S. Southern Command (USSOUTHCOM) and participating nation support for USSOUTHCOM operations. Reductions in support activities are planned, in light of other worldwide commitments.

Accordingly, the committee recommends a decrease of \$7.0 million for this purpose.

OTHER ACTIVITIES

Aircraft Carrier Force Structure

The committee notes that the Department of Defense's legislative proposal for fiscal year 2007, included a section that would effectively allow retirement of the conventionally-powered aircraft carrier, USS *John F. Kennedy*, thereby reducing the carrier force structure from 12 to 11 ships.

The committee believes that the Navy's decision to reduce the number of carriers was not based on mission requirements analysis; rather, the decision was based on fiscal constraints. Section 126 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2006 (Public Law 109-163) amended section 5062 of title 10, United States Code, to set a minimum carrier force structure of not less

than 12 operational aircraft carriers. The committee believes the aircraft carrier force structure should be maintained at 12 ships in order to meet worldwide commitments.

However, the committee would like to explore options for maintaining the USS *John F. Kennedy* in an operational status either within or outside the U.S. Navy, to include the possibility of transferring operational control to the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO). Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense to submit a report to the congressional defense committees by March 1, 2007, that examines options for maintaining the USS *John F. Kennedy* in an operational status both within and outside the U.S. Navy. In examining the NATO option, the Secretary shall coordinate an assessment with the NATO Secretary General. The report shall include the cost and manning required, statutory restrictions that would preclude transfer of the USS *John F. Kennedy* to organizations or entities outside the U.S. Navy, and a classified annex on how the Navy would meet global operational requirements with an aircraft carrier force structure of less than 12 ships.

“Commercial First” Maritime Sealift Policy

The committee is aware of recent discussions between the U.S. Transportation Command (USTRANSCOM) and the operators of U.S. flag vessels concerning the longstanding policy of using commercial vessels to transport military cargo when sufficient resources are available. Under this policy, the Department of Defense is required to, at least annually, determine the number of ships it needs to own or have under charter to meet its peacetime, contingency and wartime projected requirements. Once this “fleet” is sized, ships under charter to the U.S. Government, or government-owned ships that have been activated to full operating status, shall be used to the “maximum extent practicable” when vessel schedules satisfy cargo delivery requirements. Assuring that the multiple components of sealift capacity are fully utilized is a difficult balancing act. The United States must retain its commercial capacity and simultaneously act as good stewards of the taxpayer’s dollar when government-controlled carriers have been activated and are available. The Secretary of Defense has empowered USTRANSCOM to ensure that U.S. troops deployed worldwide have the assets they need, when they need them. This is a difficult task given the wide range of operational demands placed on U.S. armed forces at this point in time. This balancing act is not one that lends itself to a legislative solution, nor is one warranted. The committee is confident that satisfactory solutions are attainable through continuing dialogue.

Department of Defense Civil Support

The committee commends the men and women of the U.S. armed forces who played an invaluable role in helping the citizens of Louisiana, Alabama and Mississippi respond to the devastation of Hurricane Katrina and saved countless lives. The committee notes, however, that there are a number of areas where the Department of Defense (DOD) could have improved the execution of military support during Hurricane Katrina. The committee further notes that both the Final Report of the Select Bipartisan Committee to

Investigate the Preparation for and Response to Hurricane Katrina and the White House Report on the Federal Response to Hurricane Katrina identify areas where DOD response to Hurricane Katrina was lacking, and makes recommendations for improvement.

The committee is pleased that both reports emphasize the critical support provided by the respective National Guards of Alabama, Mississippi, and Louisiana in responding to this crisis, as well as the support provided by the National Guard Bureau in mobilizing assets from guard units around the nation. The committee applauds the national guard's response to Hurricane Katrina, and believes that the command and control arrangements for national guard units during this multi-state emergency worked well and should serve as a model for future multi-state responses. In short, the governors of Louisiana and Mississippi each commanded the national guard effort in their respective states, and commanded the various national guard units from across the country who volunteered to serve under previously agreed Emergency Mutual Assistance Compacts. Thus, the committee believes that national guard units, operating under the command and control of the governor, should not execute multi-state missions, and that regional, multi-state coordination of first response efforts remain a Department of Homeland Security mission. The committee believes, however, that the national guard will continue to be an essential element in any response to a domestic emergency that overwhelms first responders.

Therefore, the committee directs the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Homeland Defense to review the findings applicable to the Department made in the Final Report of the Select Bipartisan Committee to Investigate the Preparation for and Response to Hurricane Katrina. The committee also directs the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Homeland Defense to submit to the Senate Committee on Armed Services and the House Committee on Armed Services by April 1, 2007, a report detailing how the Department intends to address the issues raised by the Select Committee report and the White House report. In particular, the report shall clarify U.S. Northern Command's role in planning and executing support to the Department of Homeland Security and national guard units operating under title 32, United States Code, status during domestic contingencies.

Department of Defense Interagency Coordination in the Global War on Terrorism

The committee notes the importance of interagency coordination in all matters affecting national security, particularly in the global war on terrorism (GWOT), where success depends on the seamless application of all elements of national power. The committee is aware that the National Counterterrorism Center (NCTC) is in the process of completing the National Implementation Plan, which will provide integrated, strategic, operational plans for counterterrorism activities within and among agencies. While the committee expects that the National Implementation Plan will improve interagency coordination in the GWOT, the committee believes that the NCTC, alone, will not solve problems in interagency coordination.

The committee notes that the Department of Defense (DOD) has advocated improved interagency coordination in its National Defense Strategy, National Military Strategy and the 2006 Quadrennial Defense Review (QDR). The QDR, in particular, identifies a number of DOD initiatives aimed at improving interagency coordination.

Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense to submit to the Senate Committee on Armed Services and the House Committee on Armed Services by March 1, 2007, a report on how the Department is implementing the 2006 QDR objective of strengthening interagency operations. The report shall address how the Department is improving and strengthening internal DOD mechanisms for GWOT interagency coordination at the strategic, operational, and tactical level; and suggest means to address any remaining gaps in the interagency planning and execution process.

Department of Defense Participation in the Committee on Foreign Investment in the United States

The committee believes that the Committee on Foreign Investment in the United States (CFIUS) does not adequately scrutinize the effects on national security of mergers, acquisitions and takeovers by foreign persons, which could result in foreign control of persons engaged in interstate commerce in the United States. The committee notes that recent decisions by CFIUS, such as approving attempts by the China National Offshore Oil Corporation to acquire Unocal and Dubai Ports World to acquire operation of six U.S. ports, underscores that CFIUS is neither applying sufficient analytical rigor to its review process nor providing sufficient weight to genuine concerns about the adverse impact of such transactions on U.S. national security. The committee urges the President to reform the process to ensure that CFIUS members do not prioritize securing foreign investment in the United States ahead of protecting national security.

The committee notes that the Department of Defense is a CFIUS member and that the Department will often conduct an internal review of transactions as part of a CFIUS review. The committee is concerned that the Department may not be adequately scrutinizing and taking into consideration all of the national security implications of proposed mergers, acquisitions or takeovers under CFIUS review or voicing strongly its concerns to other CFIUS members.

Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense to submit to the Senate Committee on Armed Services and the House Committee Armed Services by April 1, 2007, a report explaining how the Department evaluates the national security implications of mergers, acquisitions or takeovers that are subject to CFIUS review. This report shall also provide examples of how the Department raised national security concerns within the CFIUS structure over the last five years, how CFIUS sought assurances to resolve such concerns and explain how the Department monitors and enforces these assurances.

Homeland Security/Defense Management Programs

The committee notes the efforts of civilian academia to provide important educational opportunities in the area of Homeland Secu-

rity/Defense Management, and supports such efforts, especially when executed in cooperation with the Homeland Security/Defense Education Consortium and other Department of Defense educational institutions. The committee encourages the Department, as well as other federal agencies and civilian institutions, to continue to support these types of programs.

Improving International Pandemic Preparedness Through Theater Security Cooperation Programs

The committee notes that the Department of Defense was successful in providing rapid humanitarian assistance to Southeast Asia following the December 2004, tsunami due, in part, to military to military agreements, relationships, and training established through U.S. Pacific Command's Theater Security Cooperation Program. Such pre-existing military agreements, relationships, and training could only prove beneficial during other disasters, including regional health epidemics or a global pandemic. The committee believes that during foreign military training and joint exercises with international partners, the Department should actively seek to improve the capabilities of military allies in the areas of surveillance and early warning of infectious disease outbreak and pandemic preparedness, particularly in Africa and Southeast Asia. The committee encourages the regional combatant commanders to review current efforts and make specific recommendations to the Secretary of Defense for opportunities to expand such efforts in fiscal years 2007 and 2008.

Increasing the Availability of Intelligence, Surveillance, and Reconnaissance Assets in the Event of a Catastrophic Natural or Man-made Disaster

The committee is aware that the federal response to Hurricane Katrina was hampered by a lack of situational awareness of post-landfall conditions along the Gulf Coast, as noted in the final report of the Select Bipartisan Committee to Investigate the Preparation for and Response to Hurricane Katrina. The Department of Defense possesses unparalleled assets for intelligence collection that are used worldwide to coordinate and support military operations.

Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense to increase the availability of these Intelligence, Surveillance, and Reconnaissance assets in the event of a catastrophic natural or man-made disaster for use in damage assessment and the coordination of relief efforts. The committee also directs the Secretary of Defense to provide a report to the congressional defense committees as to the status of this effort by January 31, 2007.

Joint Training and Certification for Nuclear, Chemical, and Biological Defense

The 2006 Quadrennial Defense Review (QDR) envisioned the future force would be organized, trained, equipped, and resourced to deal with all aspects of the threat posed by weapons of mass destruction; but the QDR provided no insight into how the Department of Defense will achieve its nuclear, chemical, and biological defense training objective. Therefore, the committee directs the As-

sistant to the Secretary of Defense for Nuclear and Chemical and Biological Defense Programs, in coordination with the Secretary of the Army, Secretary of the Navy, and Secretary of the Air Force, to perform a gap analysis on nuclear, chemical, and biological (NCB) defense training, to review NCB defense doctrine across each of the military services, and to make recommendations to the Secretary of Defense, the Senate Committee on Armed Services and the House Committee on Armed Services by October 1, 2007, regarding the implementation of joint training, certification, and doctrinal alignment for NCB defense for both the active and reserve components.

National Counter Proliferation Center

The committee commends the Director of National Intelligence for formally establishing the National Counter Proliferation Center (NCPC) on November 21, 2005. As a result of testimony received during recent Terrorism, Unconventional Threats, and Capabilities Subcommittee hearings, the committee believes that it is essential that a body within the U.S. Government integrate and coordinate all elements of national power to combat weapons of mass destruction. The committee notes that the National Security Intelligence Reform Act of 2004 (Public Law 108-458) mandates that the NCPC address seven missions and objectives. The committee is concerned that the NCPC is not, and has no plans to carry out the following two missions and objectives: (1) coordinating counter proliferation plans and activities of the various departments and agencies of the U.S. Government to prevent and halt the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction, their delivery systems, and related materials and technologies and (2) conducting strategic operational counter proliferation planning for the U.S. Government to prevent and halt the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction, their delivery systems, and related materials and technologies.

Therefore, the committee directs the Director of the NCPC to submit to the Senate Committee on Armed Services and the House Committee on Armed Services, and the Senate Select Committee on Intelligence and the House Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence by February 1, 2007, a report that explains why the NCPC has not taken steps to carry out its statutorily mandated missions and objectives to coordinate U.S. Government counter proliferation plans and activities and conduct strategic operational counter proliferation planning for the U.S. Government. The report should indicate whether the NCPC expects the President to waive any of the missions and objectives assigned to the NCPC pursuant to the National Security Intelligence Reform Act of 2004 (Public Law 108-458). In the event the NCPC will not carry out any or all of the seven of the missions and objectives detailed in the National Security Intelligence Reform Act of 2004, (Public Law 108-458) and the President will not execute a national security waiver, the report should explain how the President is meeting the requirements in section 1022 of the National Security Intelligence Reform Act of 2004 (Public Law 108-458).

Overhaul, Repair, and Maintenance of Vessels Carrying
Department of Defense Cargo

In section 1017 of this act, the committee includes an interim provision to address concerns that vessels engaged in the coastwise trades, including the domestic offshore trades, are undergoing repairs and modifications in shipyards located outside the United States. In general, vessels engaged in the coastwise trades are limited to those that are U.S. built, U.S. crewed, and U.S. owned. Also, a vessel may not be “rebuilt” in a shipyard that is not located in the United States. Thus, no vessels built outside the United States can enter these trades. Part of the current discussions, center around the fact that the Coast Guard issued section 67.177 of title 46, Code of Federal Regulations that provides guidelines on when a vessel is deemed “rebuilt.” In general, this occurs when relevant work, which is defined as work performed on its hull or superstructure, constitutes a considerable part of the hull or superstructure or when a major component of the hull or superstructure, not built in the United States, is added to a vessel. With regard to the former test, percentage limitations have been established in section 67.117(b) of title 46, Code of Federal Regulations. Specifically with respect to vessels the hull and superstructure of which is constructed of steel, certain thresholds have been established. The issue is that a vessel is deemed rebuilt when the relevant work constitutes more than ten percent of the vessel’s steelweight prior to the work. A vessel may be considered “rebuilt” if the relevant work constitutes more than 7.5 percent but not more than ten percent of the vessel’s steelweight prior to the work. The conflict which seems to exist is the Coast Guard has one test for when a vessel is initially considered to be “built” in the United States for the purposes of engaging in the coastwise trades, and another test for when a vessel is deemed “rebuilt” outside the United States, and thus losing its right to engage in the coastwise trades.

The committee is concerned that this apparent dichotomy has resulted in a number of vessels being repaired and modified in foreign shipyards. To resolve this issue, and to be fair to proponents and opponents of the practice of repairing and overhauling coastwise eligible vessels in foreign shipyards, the committee intends to conduct a hearing or series of hearings in the near-term. The committee recognizes this is a very complicated issue with significant policy ramifications, and thus chose to address this issue through an interim legislative provision in this Act. Nevertheless, hearings will provide the opportunity for all parties to present their views. The committee believes that a more detailed and permanent solution is obtainable.

Report on Strategic Language Skills

The committee notes that the Department of Defense has placed great emphasis on improving the strategic language posture of the United States. Accordingly, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense to identify objectives for developing capabilities in immediate investment languages and stronghold languages, as specified on the fiscal year 2006 Department of Defense Strategic Languages List, and develop a comprehensive implementation plan as to how the Secretary of Defense and the military departments will achieve

those objectives. The committee expects that the plan for achieving the objectives for strategic languages will be coordinated with and will complement the Secretary's report on the need for a personnel plan for linguists in the armed forces required by section 581 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2006 (Public Law 109-163).

The committee directs the Secretary to submit these language objectives and implementation plan to the Senate Committee on Armed Services and the House Committee on Armed Services by March 31, 2007.

Special Operations Command as the Supported Command in the Global War on Terrorism

The committee notes that the 2004 Unified Command Plan made U.S. Special Operations Command (USSOCOM) the supported, or lead, combatant command in the global war on terrorism (GWOT). The committee further notes that annex C of the National Military Strategic Plan for the War on Terrorism, published February 1, 2006, implements USSOCOM's designation as the supported combatant command for the GWOT by charging SOCOM with planning, synchronizing, and, as directed, executing global operations against terrorist networks. The committee finds, however, that USSOCOM's roles and responsibilities as the supported combatant command for the GWOT remain ambiguous.

Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense to submit to the Senate Committee on Armed Services and the House Committee on Armed Services by February 1, 2007, a report that clarifies the roles and responsibilities of the Commander, USSOCOM in his capacity as the supported combatant commander in the GWOT. The report shall:

- (1) Identify a clear chain of command affording the Commander, USSOCOM the authority to more effectively carry out his role as the lead Commander for GWOT planning and operations;
- (2) Explain under what circumstances will USSOCOM be directed to exercise command and control of counterterrorism operations;
- (3) Verify whether current USSOCOM acquisition, training and manning authorities are sufficient to allow Commander, USSOCOM to meet his responsibilities as the supported combatant commander for GWOT; and
- (4) Clarify the command and control relationship between the geographic combatant commanders and USSOCOM in terms of GWOT planning and operations.

Status and Implementation of Military Support for Stability, Security, Transition, and Reconstruction Operations

The committee is pleased to note that the Department of Defense issued Directive 3000.05, dated November 28, 2005, on "Military Support for Stability, Security, Transition, and Reconstruction (SSTR) Operations." Such operations will remain common critical military tasks in the foreseeable future and the Department should be fully prepared to execute such tasks. The committee believes that the Department should integrate, to the greatest extent pos-

sible, SSSTR-related requirements across its doctrine, training, logistics, organization, materiel, personnel, and facilities (DTLOM-PF).

The committee directs the Secretary of Defense to submit to the Senate Committee on Armed Services and the the House Committee on Armed Services by April 1, 2007, a report on the status and plan (including timeline) to implement the Directive across DTLOM-PFs. This report shall include, among other relevant issues, a special focus on professional military education and training, including but not limited to revisions to Academy and War College curricula, if any; training plans at the service and joint operational levels; the possible creation of SSSTR fellowships within the Agency for International Development or related organizations (including non-governmental organizations); and any reorganizations that will be required to implement the Directive.

Terrorist Use of the Internet

The committee is concerned that terrorist organizations, such as al Qaeda, are using the internet to carry out strategic and operational objectives. The committee believes that terrorist organizations should not be permitted to exploit the internet, and that the Department of Defense should take steps to combat terrorists' use of the internet.

Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense to submit to the Senate Committee on Armed Services and the House Committee on Armed Services by May 1, 2007, a report that describes how terrorist organizations use the internet, and recommend ways the Department can counter terrorists' use of the internet. The report shall also state how the Department is currently countering terrorist recruiting, training and operations that are executed through the internet, and should identify any legal challenges the Department may face in trying to combat terrorists' use of the internet.

LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS

SUBTITLE A—FINANCIAL MATTERS

Section 1001—General Transfer Authority

This section would provide fiscal year 2007 transfer authority to the Department of Defense for amounts up to \$3.75 billion.

Section 1002—Authorizations of Supplemental Appropriations for Fiscal Year 2006

This section would authorize adjustments in the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2006 (Public Law 109–163) for the Department of Defense by supplemental appropriations pursuant to such authorization.

Section 1003—Increase in Fiscal Year 2006 General Transfer Authority

This section would amend section 1001(a)(2) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2006 (Public Law 109–163)

to increase the fiscal year 2006 transfer authority from \$3.5 billion to \$3.75 billion.

Section 1004—United States Contribution to NATO Common-Funded Budgets in Fiscal Year 2007

This section would authorize the United States contribution to North Atlantic Treaty Organization common-funded budgets for fiscal year 2007, including the use of unexpended balances.

Section 1005—Report on Budgeting for Fluctuations in Fuel Cost Rates

This section would require the Secretary of Defense to submit a report to the Senate Committee on Armed Services and the House Committee on Armed Services by January 15, 2007, on the fuel costs rate projection used in the annual Department of Defense budget. This section would also require the Comptroller General to review the report and submit an assessment by March 15, 2007.

Section 1006—Reduction in Authorizations Due to Savings Resulting From Lower-than-Expected Inflation

The Department of Defense assumed an inflation rate of 2.2 percent in its fiscal year 2007 budget submission. However, according to the House Budget Committee's report (109–402), the Congressional Budget Office's estimate of inflation is 0.4 percentage points lower than the President's request for fiscal year 2007. The savings resulting from the lower-than-expected inflation for fiscal year 2007 is \$1,583 million less than the budget request.

SUBTITLE B—POLICY RELATING TO NAVAL VESSELS AND SHIPYARDS

Section 1011—Transfer of Naval Vessels to Foreign Nations Based Upon Vessel Class

This section would allow the transfer of a specified number of ships to a particular nation without identification of the specific vessel by hull number or ship name. Section 7037 of title 10, United States Code, requires legislative approval for the transfer to other nations of specific vessels exceeding 3,000 tons or vessels that are less than 20-years-old. The legislative approval process typically begins two years or more prior to the actual decommissioning of the U.S. Navy vessel and ship transfer. Decommissioning plans frequently change as a result of changing operational commitments, material condition, and other factors. Linking a specific vessel to a specific country can result in a lost transfer opportunity if that vessel's decommissioning status changes. Additionally, it must be replaced by another vessel of the same class as a transfer candidate.

This section would better support the goal of affecting "hot" ship transfers. Hot ship transfers reduce the cost of decommissioning preparation and lay-up for the U.S. Navy and may support a higher selling price for the ship as an "excess defense article." For the purchaser, a hot ship transfer is advantageous because it eliminates reactivation costs attributed to long post-decommissioning lay-up and because the ship transfer can be more quickly and economically realized.

This section would still require Congress to authorize the release of specific naval capabilities and technologies to specific countries, but it would provide flexibility to best match available decommissioned ships to customer navies' requirements. Finally, Congress would still be free to designate specific ships to specific countries where circumstances dictated.

Section 1012—Overhaul, Repair, and Maintenance of Vessels in Foreign Shipyards

The committee includes a provision that will clarify those commonwealths and possessions that are to be considered as part of the United States for the purposes of naval vessels to include any Military Sealift Command vessels that are owned or chartered under the jurisdiction of the Secretary of Navy. This section also further defines the term emergency voyage repair and extends the limitations on overhaul, repair and maintenance of vessels in foreign shipyards.

Section 1013—Report on Options for Future Lease Arrangement for Guam Shipyard

This section would require the Secretary of Navy to submit a report to the Senate Committee on Armed Services and the House Committee on Armed Services by December 15, 2006, on the Guam Shipyard located in San Rita, Guam. This section would also require the Comptroller General to submit an evaluation of the Secretary of Navy's report to the Senate Committee on Armed Services and the House Committee on Armed Services by March 1, 2007.

Under the statutory authority of section 2304c(3) of title 10, United States Code, and the Federal Acquisition Regulation 6.302-3(a)(2)(i), the Navy has been awarding non-competitive contracts to Guam Shipyard located in San Rita, Guam since fiscal year 1998 to maintain the industrial base in support of national strategic objectives. In 1998, Commander, U.S. Pacific Fleet determined that maintaining a private ship repair capability in Guam is a matter of national strategic importance for future defense operations in the western Pacific.

In a report to Congress on Repair of Military Sealift Command Ships dated May 2004, the Commander, U.S. Pacific Fleet validated the importance of this shipyard. In the fiscal year 2006 Class Justification and Approval For Other Than Full and Open Competition, the Commander, U.S. Pacific Fleet again determined that maintaining a private ship repair capability as a mobilization base facility on Guam is a matter of vital strategic importance for operations in the Western Pacific Area of Responsibility. In support of that determination, the Commander U.S. Pacific Fleet submitted a letter to the Commander, Military Sealift Command on March 30, 2005, that stated:

“Guam is strategically located with respect to those Asian countries that border the Pacific-Rim and provides an excellent site for logistical support to the Navy's operating forces in that region. With the U.S. Navy's continuing focus on the Pacific Area of Responsibility, the former U.S. Naval Ship Repair Facility Guam, due to its geographically unique location and positive force protection

status, is essential to our ability to respond to possible contingencies.”

Until such time as the Secretary of the Navy prepares the requested report, this section would further require the awarding of contracts under the authority of section 2304(c)(3) of title 10, United States Code and section 6.302–3(a)(2)(i) of the Federal Acquisition Regulation in an equal to the average amount awarded between Fiscal Year 1998 and Fiscal Year 2006. The committee supports the Secretary of Navy’s decision to continue to designate the Guam Shipyard as critical to maintaining the industrial base in support of national strategic objectives, as certified by the Commander, U.S. Pacific Fleet, for each of the past eight fiscal years.

Section 1014—Shipbuilding Industrial Base Improvement Program

This section would establish a program to provide grants and loan guarantees to U.S. shipbuilders to make capital investments in their shipbuilding processes and facilities to improve the efficiency, cost-effectiveness, and quality of U.S. ship construction and promote the international competitiveness of U.S. shipyards. This section would authorize the Secretary of the Navy to solicit and approve grant applications from shipbuilding companies to research and develop innovative technologies, processes and infrastructure to improve the efficiency and cost-effectiveness of naval vessel construction. This section would also authorize the Secretary of the Navy to provide loan guarantees to shipyards to purchase and implement a technology, a process or an infrastructure improvement that he determines will improve the productivity and cost-effectiveness of naval vessel construction. This section would also require the Secretary of the Navy to perform annual assessments of the shipbuilding industrial base to determine where and to what extent inefficiencies exist and to what extent innovative design and production technologies, processes and infrastructure can be developed to alleviate such inefficiencies. This section would also require that funding for the National Shipbuilding Research Program be separately identified and set forth in budget justification materials submitted to Congress for that fiscal year in support of that budget.

Section 1015—Transfer of Operational Control of Certain Patrol Coastal Ships to Coast Guard

This section would require the Secretary of the Navy to enter into an agreement with the Commandant of the Coast Guard for the transfer of operational control of not less than five 179 foot Cyclone class patrol coastal ships for a period extending at least through September 30, 2012.

Section 1016—Limitation on Leasing of Foreign-Built Vessels

This section would amend section 2401 of title 10, United States Code, to prohibit the secretary of a military department from entering into a contract for lease or charter of a vessel for a term of more than 24 months, including all options to renew or extend the contract, if the hull or superstructure of that vessel was constructed in a foreign shipyard.

Section 1017—Overhaul, Repair, and Maintenance of Vessels
Carrying Department of Defense Cargo

This section would provide that the Secretary of Defense may not award any contract for the carriage by vessel of cargo for the Department of Defense, unless the contract includes a requirement under which the contractor shall ensure that the overhaul and repair work is done in a shipyard located in the United States or the contractor must report any repair work conducted in a shipyard located outside the United States.

Section 1018—Riding Gang Member Documentation Requirement

This section would prohibit the Secretary of Defense from awarding a charter or a contract for carriage of defense cargo unless the charter or contract requires that each riding gang member that performs any work on the vessel during the effective period of the charter or contract holds a merchant mariner's document issued by the U.S. Coast Guard. This section also allows the Secretary of Defense to issue regulations to exempt a riding gang member from the above requirement under limited circumstances, and then only if a background check is performed.

SUBTITLE C—COUNTER-DRUG ACTIVITIES

Section 1021—Restatement in Title 10, United States Code, and
Revision of Department of Defense Authority to Provide Support
for Counter-Drug Activities of Federal, State, Local, and Foreign
Law Enforcement Agencies

This section would codify section 1004 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1991 (Public Law 101-510), as amended by section 1021(a) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2002 (Public Law 107-107). The current authority, which would expire at the end of fiscal year 2006, enables the Department of Defense to assist the counter-drug activities of any other department or agency of the federal government or of any State, local, or foreign law enforcement agencies. This support includes the maintenance and repair of equipment; transportation of personnel; establishment and operation of bases of operation or training facilities; counter-drug related training of law enforcement personnel; the detection, monitoring, and communication of air and sea traffic; construction of roads, fences and installation lighting, establishment of command, control, communications, and computer networks; provision of linguist and intelligence analysis services; and aerial and ground reconnaissance.

Section 1022—Restatement in Title 10, United States Code, and
Revision of Department of Defense Authority to Provide Support
for Counter-Drug Activities of Certain Foreign Governments

This section would codify and expand section 1033 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1998 (Public Law 105-85), as amended by section 1021 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2004 (Public Law 108-136). The current authority, which would expire at the end of fiscal year 2006, enables the Department of Defense (DOD) to provide counter-drug

equipment in addition to that provided under section 1004 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1991 (Public Law 101–510), as amended by section 1021(a) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2002 (Public Law 107–107), to nations in South America and Central Asia, including: Colombia, Peru, Ecuador, Bolivia, Afghanistan, Pakistan, Uzbekistan, Turkmenistan and Tajikistan.

Additionally, this section would expand the authority to include countries that are located in primary narcotics-trafficking routes in Central America and Central Asia, including: Panama, Guatemala, Belize, Azerbaijan, Kazakhstan and Kyrgyzstan. During calendar year 2006, incidents against Afghan security forces by narcotics traffickers have increased. Most of these incidents involved small arms, machine guns, rocket propelled grenades, and improvised explosive devises. Afghan security forces need to be armed to effectively deal with narcotics traffickers. The Government of Afghanistan raised the issue of security forces obtaining additional arms and ammunition support at the recent United States-Afghanistan Strategic Partnership meeting held in Washington, DC in March 2006. In the Emergency Supplemental Appropriations Act for Defense, the Global War on Terror, and Tsunami Relief, 2005 (Public Law 109–13), Congress authorized providing Afghanistan crew-served weapons. Pursuant to this authority, the U.S. Government has provided the government of Afghanistan with two DShKMs heavy machine guns (.50-caliber). This section would also establish the authority to provide crew-served weapons of .50-caliber or less to Afghanistan for fiscal years 2007 and 2008. This section would also authorize that during fiscal years 2007 and 2008, \$20.0 million of additional expenditures under this authority should be authorized each fiscal year, for a total of \$60.0 million each fiscal year.

This section would also require the Secretary of Defense, in consultation with the Secretary of State, to prepare a counter-drug plan for the governments to which support will be provided under this section. This section would require the Department of Defense to submit the annual plans to the congressional defense committees and the Senate Committee on Foreign Affairs and the House Committee on International Relations by December 31st of each year.

Section 1023—Extension of Authority to Support Unified Counter-Drug and Counterterrorism Campaign in Colombia

This section would extend the continuation of authorities provided in section 1021 of the Ronald W. Reagan National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2005, (Public Law 108–375) which allow the Department of Defense to support a unified campaign in Colombia against narcotics trafficking and terrorist organizations for fiscal years 2007 and 2008. This section would also extend the limitation on the number of U.S. military and federally funded civilian contractor personnel in the Republic of Colombia through fiscal year 2008. Section 1021 limited the number of military personnel in Colombia in fiscal years 2005 and 2006 to 800 people and the number of federally funded civilian contractors employed to support Plan Colombia to 600 people. This section would extend these authorities for an additional two years to provide support to the consolidation phase of Plan Colombia, the Government of Colombia's long-term blueprint to end the country's long-running

civil war, reduce narcotics trafficking, and promote economic and social development.

Section 1024—Continuation of Reporting Requirement Regarding Department of Defense Expenditures to Support Foreign Counter-Drug Activities

This section would extend by one year the requirement for the Secretary of Defense to submit a report detailing the expenditure of funds by the Secretary during fiscal year 2006 in direct and indirect support of the counter-drug activities of foreign governments. This requirement was reinstated for fiscal year 2005. The committee notes that the Department of Defense has increased its level of counternarcotics assistance to foreign law enforcement agencies and militaries in recent years. The committee believes it should continue to monitor such expenditures closely.

Section 1025—Report on Interagency Counternarcotics Plan for Afghanistan and South and Central Asian Regions

This section would require the Secretary of Defense to submit a report to the congressional defense committees by February 15, 2007, updating the interagency counternarcotics implementation plan for Afghanistan and the South and Central Asian regions. The committee notes that the Secretary of Defense failed to submit a report on this matter, as directed by the committee, by December 31, 2005.

SUBTITLE D—OTHER MATTERS

Section 1031—Revision to Authorities Relating to Commission on the Implementation of the New Strategic Posture of the United States

This section would extend the assessment horizon of the Commission of the Implementation of the New Strategic Posture of the United States, as established in section 1051 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2006 (Public Law 109–163), from 2008 to 2025. This horizon pertains particularly to the commission's assessment of the ability of the current nuclear stockpile to address the evolving strategic threat environment and the commission's recommendations on changes to nuclear stockpile and infrastructure required to preserve a nuclear capability commensurate with that threat environment.

This section would also change the commission's report date from June 30, 2007, to 18 months after commencement of commission activities and the commission's termination date from July 30, 2007, to 60 days after the report submission.

Section 1032—Enhancement to Authority to Pay Rewards for Assistance in Combating Terrorism

This section would increase the flexibility and responsiveness of the counterterrorism reward program by allowing the combatant commanders to delegate approval authority for such rewards, which may amount to \$50,000 each, to the commander of a command directly subordinate to that combatant commander. Such delegation of authority to a subordinate commander must have the ap-

proval of the Secretary of Defense, the Deputy Secretary of Defense, or an Under Secretary of Defense designated by the Secretary. This section would also increase reward authority, which the combatant commander may further delegate, from \$2,500 to \$10,000.

Section 1033—Report on Assessment Process of Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff Relating to Global War on Terrorism

This section would direct the Secretary of Defense to submit to the Senate Committee on Armed Services and the House Committee on Armed Services by March 1, 2007, a report on the findings of the semi-annual global war on terrorism (GWOT) assessment process described in the Implementation and Assessment Annex (annex R) of the National Military Strategic Plan for the War on Terrorism (NMSP-WOT).

The committee is encouraged by the Joint Chiefs of Staff effort to develop and publish a “NMSP-WOT.” The committee believes that this document effectively presents the approach the Department of Defense will take in fulfilling its role within the national strategy for combating terrorism. The committee notes with interest that the NMSP-WOT sets military priorities for the GWOT, establishes a set of metrics for evaluating progress in the global war on terrorism and implements an assessment process.

Section 1034—Presidential Report on Improving Interagency Support for United States 21st Century National Security Missions

This section would require the President to submit to Congress by February 1, 2007, a report that identifies interagency capabilities needed to achieve U.S. national security goals and objectives in the 21st century, describing how best to enhance the integration of those capabilities with those of the deployed military, and discussing the criteria and considerations used to evaluate progress in building and integration such capacity. This section would further require the President to make recommendations for improving interagency coordination in the form of specific legislative proposals.

Since 2002, the administration has outlined broad U.S. national security goals and objectives through several strategy documents, including the March 2006 National Security Strategy, the November 2005 National Strategy for Victory in Iraq, the February 2003 National Strategy for Combating Terrorism, and the July 2002 National Strategy for Homeland Security. The Department of Defense (DOD) has complemented these documents with its own defense-specific strategies, such as the 2005 National Defense Strategy and the 2004 National Military Strategy. Most recently, the 2006 Quadrennial Defense Review (QDR) laid out DOD’s perspective on ways in which to execute these various security and defense strategies. In particular, the QDR highlighted the need for improved, robust interagency capacity to complement the work done by deployed military forces in achieving U.S. national security goals.

The committee believes it is critical that the President provide his view on both the civilian and military capabilities required to address 21st century national security challenges and the extent to which such federal departments and agencies must integrate these

capabilities for optimal effectiveness. Moreover, the committee seeks the President's view on the possible legislative changes that might strengthen U.S. national security. Toward this end and recognizing the complexity of the current and emerging national security challenges, the committee urges the President to incorporate the inputs of the broadest practicable group of national security players into this report, including representatives of domestic departments and agencies that must coordinate in planning and response to national and homeland security challenges.

Section 1035—Quarterly Reports on 2006 Quadrennial Defense Review Report Implementation

This section would require the Secretary of Defense to submit to the Senate Committee on Armed Services and the House Committee on Armed Services quarterly reports on the processes and procedures to examine the various recommendations of the 2006 Quadrennial Defense Review (QDR), implementation plans and strategies for each area highlighted by the QDR report, and relevant information about the status of such implementation. Because the national security environment of the 21st century is evolving rapidly, these reports would also indicate changes in the Secretary's assessment of the defense strategies or capabilities required since the publication of the 2006 Quadrennial Defense Review Report. This section would require that the Secretary submit the first report by January 31, 2007, and would terminate the reporting requiring upon publication of the next QDR report or upon notification by the Secretary to the armed services committees that implementation is complete, whichever comes first.

The committee recognizes that the latest QDR Report describes the complex security challenges facing armed forces in the 21st century, clearly indicating that the document reflects a "snapshot in time" regarding the Department of Defense's (DOD) strategy and the capabilities required to execute that strategy, and notes that the Department is in the process of transformation. The Department devoted significant analytical resources to ensure that the QDR process identified various scenarios and described the types of capabilities, ranging from weapons platforms to cultural and language skills to combat support and combat service support elements, that are required to prevail in these scenarios and shape the international security environment.

The QDR also reflects the reality that the U.S. Government must develop, procure, and employ such capabilities through a long-term strategy. The committee understands that the Department has developed several working groups to examine various areas that may impact future authorities and funding requests by the Department.

For example, the committee notes that in the post-September 11th world, irregular warfare—or conflicts in which enemy combatants are not regular military forces of nation-states—has emerged as a primary form of warfare confronting the United States and that developing irregular warfare capability is critical to military success in the global war on terrorism. The QDR report stipulates that while sustaining capabilities to address conventional combat operations, the Department must develop and enhance capabilities to carry out long-duration operations, unconventional warfare, foreign internal defense, counterterrorism, counterinsurgency and sta-

bilization, and reconstruction operations. In particular, the QDR report identifies irregular warfare as an area that will need continuous reassessment and improvement in the coming years and requires the development of a “roadmap” by a working group to address such issues.

Because implementing the QDR recommendations in irregular warfare and other areas will require strong commitment and emphasis from not only the Secretary of Defense and leaders from other federal departments and agencies but also from Congress, it is critical that the Secretary of Defense maintain robust, timely information flow to the armed services committees, particularly on the work of these QDR-related groups.

Section 1036—Increased Hunting and Fishing Opportunities for Members of the Armed Forces, Retired Members, and Disabled Veterans

This section would require the Secretary of Defense to ensure that service members, military retirees, disabled veterans, and persons assisting disabled veterans are able to utilize Department of Defense (DOD) lands that are available for hunting and fishing. This section would also require the Secretary to report to Congress within 180 days of enactment of this Act on actions necessary to increase the availability of DOD lands to such persons for hunting and fishing activities.

Finally, this section would require the Secretary of the Interior to cease plans to exterminate deer and elk on Santa Rosa Island, California by helicopter and would prohibit the Secretary from exterminating or nearly exterminating the deer and elk on the island. Under current plans, all deer and elk will be eliminated from the island by 2012.

Section 1037—Technical and Clerical Amendments

This section would make a number of technical and clerical amendments to existing law of a non-substantive nature.

Section 1038—Database of Emergency Response Capabilities

This section would direct the Secretary of Defense to ensure that the Department of Defense maintains a database of emergency response capabilities for domestic disasters. The committee believes that a single entity in the Department should be responsible for tracking the full range of military disaster response capabilities that exist domestically. The committee acknowledges U.S. Northern Command’s role in domestic disaster preparedness and response, and recommends that it be involved in this effort.

Section 1039—Information on Certain Criminal Investigations and Prosecutions

This section would expand the annual reporting requirement in section 1093 of the Ronald W. Reagan National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2005 (Public Law 108-375) to include a detailed and comprehensive description of any investigation or prosecution, and any resulting judicial or non-judicial punishment or other disciplinary action, for any violation of international obliga-

tions or laws of the United States regarding the treatment of individuals detained by the U.S. armed forces or by a person providing services to the Department of Defense on a contractual basis, if such information would not compromise any ongoing criminal or administrative investigation or prosecution.

This section would also include additional information on investigations and prosecutions for any officer nominated for command, or nominated for promotion or appointment to a position requiring the advice and consent of the Senate, which should be clearly designated as such. The information in connection with nominations shall be submitted to the House Committee on Armed Services and the Senate Committee on Armed Services on a regular, timely basis in advance of any nomination.

Section 1040—Date for Final Report of EMP Commission

This section would direct the Electromagnetic Pulse (EMP) Attack Commission, established by title 14 of the Floyd D. Spence National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2001 (Public Law 106–398), and reestablished by section 1042 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2006 (Public Law 109–163) to move its final report date from June 30, 2007, to 18 months after commencement of commission activities.

TITLE XI—CIVILIAN PERSONNEL MATTERS

ITEM OF SPECIAL INTEREST

Performance Periods Established in Connection with Public-private Competitions

The committee notes that civilian in-house workforces and contractor workforces who win A–76 competitions are treated differently with respect to recompetitions at the end of their performance periods. The committee also notes that OMB Circular A–76 (revised May 29, 2003), while technically allowing an in-house workforce to receive an extension to the performance period, in effect, rarely results in an extension. The committee further notes that in contrast, the regulations in the Federal Acquisition Regulations regarding contractor performance periods appear to result in frequent extensions to contractor performance periods. The committee believes that this apparent disparity may prejudice civilian in-house employees.

The committee directs the Secretary of Defense, in coordination with the Office of Management and Budget, to examine this apparent inequity and report to the congressional defense committees by March 1, 2007. The report its findings shall include an analysis and comparison of recompetitions conducted since January 1, 2001 through the date of the enactment of this Act to determine the frequency of in-house extensions and contractor extensions. The report shall also examine the existing regulations governing recompetitions to identify areas of possible disparity between in-house and contractor workforces. The committee further directs the Secretary to provide recommendations regarding any inequities between the in-house and contractor workforces disclosed in this examination.